

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. The Examiner maintained the rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Lopez-Torres et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,647) (hereinafter, *Lopez*.)

As indicated above, independent Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 have been amended to further define the present invention. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced.

As to independent Claim 1, the Examiner maintained the allegation, among other things, that *Lopez* teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1. Specifically, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner states that *Lopez*, in col. 1, lines 45-49, teaches a communication system that is equally applicable to a Packet Data Service Network (PDSN), as presently disclosed and claimed in the present application. However, after reviewing *Lopez* in its entirety, and in view of the amendment to Claim 1, as set forth above, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's §102(e) rejection.

The present invention is directed to a method for setting and clearing a concurrent service between a mobile switching center (MSC) and a base station, to provide a new service while providing an existing service. In contrast, *Lopez* essentially discloses a mobile services switching center for allowing a multi-dialogue communication to take place between a first subscriber station (MS1, MS2,...MSn) and a second subscriber station (ISDN, ST1) through a mobile services switching center (MSC/VLR) of a public land mobile network (PLMN).

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended, as set forth above. In this case, nothing in *Lopez* fairly teaches or even suggests, in part, the recitation of a mobile communication system having a switching center (MSC) wherein the MSC “determines whether the newly requested second service is identical to the presently connected first service by comparing a service option” as presently recited in amended Claim 1. Moreover, *Lopez* makes no mention of a requested second service being either “a voice service” or “a packet service,” as also recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, as *Lopez* does not teach each and every limitation of amended Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 is now believed to be allowable over *Lopez*.

As to independent Claims 3, 5 and 7, the Examiner also maintained their rejection §102(e) contending that these claims contained similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. However, Claims 3, 5, and 7 have also been amended, as set forth above, in a manner similar to amended Claim 1. Thus, in view of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 5 and 7 are also believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons.

As to dependent Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8, the Examiner also maintained their rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), respectively. However, it is acknowledged that these claims are all dependent claims; accordingly, if the above arguments place the independent claims into condition for allowance, it is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are likewise believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.

Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel: (516) 228-3565

Fax: (516) 228-8475